



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,470	12/12/2003	Anand R. Kumar	7178-41.4	4313
27128 7590 03/19/2010 HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS LLP 190 Carondelet Plaza Suite 600 ST. LOUIS, MO 63105				
EXAMINER				
PRESTON, JOHN O				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3691				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/19/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pto-sl@huschblackwell.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/735,470

Applicant(s)

KUMAR ET AL.

Examiner

JOHN O. PRESTON

Art Unit

3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to the application filed on December 12, 2003.
2. Claims 1-45 are currently pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-9 recite a process comprising the step(s) of providing. Based on Supreme Court precedent, a proper method/process must be tied to a machine or transform underlying subject matter to a different state or thing (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876)). Since neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not considered a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. 101. To qualify as a statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplished the method steps or positively reciting the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state. The claims at issue do not recite any machine that carries out the act of "providing" in the method.

A mere field-of-use limitation is generally insufficient to render an otherwise ineligible method claim patent eligible. This means the machine or transformation must impose

meaningful limits on the method claim's scope to pass the test. In addition, insignificant extra-solution activity will not transform an unpatentable principle into a patentable process. This means reciting a specific machine or a particular transformation of a specific article in an insignificant step, such as data gathering or outputting, is not sufficient to pass the test. See *In re Bilski*, 545 F.3d 943, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

5. Claims 10-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 10-45 are directed to a computer program per se or data structure of a computer or software and therefore not statutory under 35 U.S. C. 101. Furthermore, claims 10-45 do not recite any structural components that comprise the claimed system or tool. This is exemplified in *In re Warmerdam* 31 USPQ2d 1754 where the rejection of a claim to a disembodied data structure was affirmed. Thus a claim to a data structure, per se, or other functional descriptive material, including computer programs, per se, is not patent eligible subject matter.

Functional descriptive material claimed in combination with an appropriate computer readable medium to enable the functionality to be realized is patent eligible subject matter if it is capable of producing a useful, concrete and tangible result when used in the computer system. Compare *Warmerdam* to *In re Lowry* 32 USPQ2d 1031 where a memory with a data structure that increased computing efficiency was patentable.

The computer readable medium loaded with a computer program and in association with a computer provides the functional descriptive material in usable form to permit the functionality to be realized with the computer. A program product which does not explicitly include such a medium, a program per se, a signal or other type of transmission media that fails to include the hardware necessary to realize the functionality (e.g., a transmitter or a receiver), and a piece of paper with the functional descriptive material written on it are all examples of media which are not believed to enable the functionality to be realized with the computer. "[I]nstructions for creating..." is considered as a source code or software per se.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 10-15, 17-19, 21-34, and 36-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hanagan (2001/0056362 A1).

Claim 10: Hanagan discloses the following limitation(s):

- a billing information component; an account management component; an equipment management component; and an integrated user interface; (Hanagan: pgh 22-44; 415)
- wherein said integrated user interface is customer centered and providing interaction between a customer service representative and said billing component, said account management component, and said equipment management component; (Hanagan: pgh 48)
- said billing component providing access to billing information of a customer and the charges associated with one or more services provided to one or more accounts of said customer; (Hanagan: pgh 415)
- wherein said one or more accounts are managed and setup utilizing said account management component; (Hanagan: pgh 165)
- said equipment management component providing information and access relating to any one or more equipment items associated with

providing said one or more services to said customer. (Hanagan: pgh 79-81)

Claim 11: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 10. Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- The system of claim 10 further comprising a work management component, wherein said work management component provides and receives information from said customer service representative relating to one or more tasks that are to be provided by a service provider. (Hanagan: pgh 79-81)

Claim 12: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 11. Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- The system of claim 11 wherein said work management component further manages work flows and work queues associated with said one or more tasks. (Hanagan: pgh 81)

Claim 13: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 12. Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 13. The system of claim 12, wherein said management of work flows entails categorizing of said one or more tasks by assignment, output for end user interaction, and system functions including process initiation or application launching. (Hanagan: pgh 81)

Claim 14: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 10. Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 14. The system of claim 10 wherein said account management component comprises an account-receivables component, which includes customer status details, payment designation and allocation, and selective posting of payments to multiple providers. (Hanagan: pgh 79-81)

Claim 15: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 10.

Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 15. The system of claim 10, wherein said account management component comprises a credit-rating component, which includes event tracking and weighting assignments. (Hanagan: pgh 77)

Claim 17: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 10.

Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 17. The system of claim 10 further comprising one or more feature and transaction modules. (Hanagan: pgh 54)

Claim 18: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 17.

Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 18. The system of claim 17, wherein said one or more feature and transaction module is a photographic view module for providing displays of customer bills. (Hanagan: pgh 50)

Claim 19: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 17.

Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 19. The system of claim 17, wherein said one or more feature and transaction modules is a seasonal specification module for associating customer addresses with seasonal periods. 201 The system of claim 17, wherein said one or more feature and transaction modules is a training tools for the training of customer service representatives. (Hanagan: pgh 77)

Claim 21: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 17.

Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 21. The system of claim 17, wherein said one or more feature and transaction modules is a caller identification module which integrates

caller identification into the customer care tool. (Hanagan: pgh 87 and 416)

Claim 22: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 17. Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 22. The system of claim 17, wherein said one or more feature and transaction modules is a map view module which integrates map viewing into the customer care tool. (Hanagan: pgh 401)

Claim 23: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 10. Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 23. The system of claim 10 further comprising a technical support component including messaging and exchange of display information and diagnostic data, wherein messaging and exchange occur between a customer service representative and a vendor of said customer care tool. (Hanagan: pgh 22)

Claim 24: Hanagan discloses the following limitation(s):

- a hierarchy component for classifying the system representation of one or more service items that relate to one or more accounts of a customer; (Hanagan: pgh 77)
- means for utilizing said classification to organize, present and access information pertaining to said service items; and (Hanagan: pgh 77)
- an integrated user interface component to present and access information pertaining to said service items, wherein said integrated user interface provides a navigational display for accessing said one or more service items. (Hanagan: pgh 54)

Claim 25: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 24. Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 25. The system of claim 24 wherein said integrated user interface further comprises a contact tracking component. (Hanagan: pgh 81)

Claim 26: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 24. Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 26. The system of claim 24 wherein said integrated user interface further comprises an event generation component that initiates of one or more events that are necessary to complete a task selected by the customer service representative. (Hanagan: pgh 82)

Claim 27: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 26. Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 27. The system of claim 26 wherein said selected task is the addition of a new telephone service and said one or more events includes as necessary, creating a work order for the physical wiring and creating an order for phone poles or other equipment. (Hanagan: pgh 262)

Claim 28: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 24. Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 28. The system of claim 24, wherein said hierarchy of classification comprises a customer at a first level, one or more accounts at a second level and one or more agreements at a third level, with a one to one or more relationship between said customer and said accounts and a one to one or more relationship between said accounts and said agreements. (Hanagan: pgh 336)

Claim 29: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 28. Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 29. The system of claim 28 wherein said agreement is for a telephone service. (Hanagan: pgh 9)

- Claim 30: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 28.
Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):
- 30. The system of claim 28 wherein said agreement is for a gas service. (Hanagan: pgh 9)
- Claim 31: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 28.
Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):
- 31. The system of claim 28 wherein said agreement is for a power service. (Hanagan: pgh 9)
- Claim 32: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 28.
Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):
- 32. The system of claim 28, wherein said customer service care system is a utility service care system. (Hanagan: pgh 9-22)
- Claim 33: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 28.
Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):
- 33. The system of claim 28, wherein said customer service care system is a telecommunications service care system. (Hanagan: pgh 22)
- Claim 34: Hanagan discloses the following limitation(s):
- a service order component; a service agreement component; a payment collection and adjustment component; and a customer centric user interface; (Hanagan: pgh 22-44; 415)
 - said service order component, said service agreement component, and said payment and adjustment component interfaced to said customer centric user interface; (Hanagan: pgh 81-86)
 - said customer centric user interface providing a hierarchical relationship between a customer, an account and an agreement for

providing customer care and managing customer related operations.

(Hanagan: pgh 77)

Claim 36: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 34.

Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 36. The system of claim 34 further comprising a security component for monitoring access and rights to various aspects of the customer care and operations tool. (Hanagan: pgh 324)

Claim 37: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 34.

Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 37. The system of claim 34 further comprising user definable fields for recording or displaying customized information. (Hanagan: pgh 268)

Claim 38: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 34.

Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 38. The system of claim 34, wherein said service order component provides support for a plurality of service types including telephone, wireless, internet, pager, and cable television. (Hanagan: pgh 105)

Claim 39: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 38.

Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 39. The system of claim 38, wherein selection of a first service type presents a first number of display tabs; wherein selection of a second service type presents a second number of display tabs; and wherein said display tabs correspond to a view of information items relating to an aspect of the corresponding service type. (Hanagan: pgh 110)

Claim 40: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 38.

Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 40. The system of claim 38 further comprising support for one or more local service items along with the corresponding charges. (Hanagan: pgh 105)

Claim 41: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 40. Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 41. The system of claim 40, wherein said one or more local service items includes one or more items from the group consisting of: call waiting, call forwarding and caller id, wherein said one or more service items is presented as a display tab. (Hanagan: pgh 106)

Claim 42: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 34. Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 42. The system of claim 34 further comprising one or more components from a group consisting of, with payment module, non-pay reconnect module, write-off trigger module,,real-time charge and credit module, balance transfer module, and e-bill presentment and payment module. (Hanagan: pgh 143)

Claim 43: Hanagan discloses the following limitation(s):

- 43. A system for providing a customer care graphical user interface comprising: a customer care computing system having an executable customer care application operably stored thereon where said customer care application is operable to control the computing system to access customer care data relating to general customer data and management data and generate a graphical user interface having a navigation scheme operable to provide a single point of entry user interface where customer information and account information is continuously in view. (Hanagan: pgh 143)

Art Unit: 3691

Claim 44: Hanagan discloses the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 43.

Hanagan further discloses the following limitation(s):

- 44. The system for providing a customer care user interface as recited in claim 43 wherein the management data include reports, billing and work flow data. (Hanagan: pgh 175)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claims 1-9, 16, 35, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagan and in view of Brown (US 6,385,652 B1).

Claim 1: In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan suggests:

- providing a care system having a single point of entry graphical user interface, wherein said care system includes preconfigured links and relationships among one or more screens of said care system; (Hanagan: pgh 77)
- providing an option to set aside one or more work areas, wherein said set aside option preserves a first set of tasks or features being utilized by said customer service representative, during the performance of a second set of tasks or features; (Hanagan: pgh 78)
- (2)a search window providing search access to said informational items, (Hanagan: pgh 81)
- (3) an alert window providing pre-configured notifications to the customer service representative (Hanagan: pgh 168)
- (4) a summary area providing provides synopsis of said informational items, and (Hanagan: 137)
- 5) a content area providing details of said informational items. (Hanagan: pgh 313)

Hanagan does not teach the remaining limitations. However, Brown suggests:

- said single point of entry graphical user interface comprising, (1) a navigation window, providing a tree display of options for access to a plurality of informational items relating to servicing a focus customer, (Brown: col 4, lines 55-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the elements cited in Hanagan with the elements as taught by Brown because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each

element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately.

Claim 2: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 1. In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan suggests:

- The method of claim 1 further comprising providing one or more customizable fields, that are incorporated into the graphical user interface and informational items of the customer care system. (Hanagan: pgh 236)

Claim 3: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 1. In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan suggests:

- The method of claim 1 wherein said second tasks or features is attending to a second customer. (Hanagan: pgh 81; 267-269)

Claim 4: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 1. In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan suggests:

- The method of claim 1 wherein said care system is configured for a utility company. (Hanagan: pgh 9)

Claim 5: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 4. In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan suggests:

- 5. The method of claim 4 wherein said care system further provides functions to address deregulation requirements of said utility company. (Hanagan: pgh 84)

Claim 6: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 1. In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan suggests:

- 6. The method of claim 1, wherein said care system is customer centered and provides retrieval, display and grouping of information by customer. (Hanagan: pgh 50 and 181)

Claim 7: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 1. In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan suggests:

- 7. The method of claim 1, wherein said navigation window, search window, alert window, summary area and content area are simultaneously presented to the customer service representative. (Hanagan: pgh 97)

Claim 8: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 1. In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan suggests:

- 8. a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in claim 1. (Hanagan: pgh 314)

Claim 9: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 8. In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan suggests:

- 9. A computer system having a memory, an operating system and a central processor, said processor being operable to execute the instructions stored on the computer-readable medium of claim 8. pgh 411)

Claim 16: Hanagan teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 10. Hanagan does not teach the remaining limitation. However, Brown suggests:

- 16. The system of claim 10, wherein said integrated user interface includes a main navigation tree, hyperlinks, push buttons, and browser-like page forward/page backward functionality (Brown: col 4, lines 55-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the elements cited in Hanagan with the elements as taught by Brown because the claimed invention is

merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately.

Claim 35: Hanagan teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 34. Hanagan does not teach the remaining limitation. However, Brown suggests:

- 35. The system of claim 34 wherein said customer centric user interface includes a navigation window, a summary area and a content window. (Brown: col 4, lines 55-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the elements cited in Hanagan with the elements as taught by Brown because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately.

Claim 45: Hanagan teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 43. Hanagan does not teach the remaining limitation. However, Brown suggests:

- 45. The system as recited in claim 43 wherein the navigation scheme includes a main navigation tree, hyperlinks, push buttons, and browser-like page forward/page backward functionality. (Brown: col 4, lines 55-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the elements cited in Hanagan with the elements as taught by Brown because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately.

Art Unit: 3691

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **John Preston** whose telephone number is **571.270.3918**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **ALEXANDER KALINOWSKI** can be reached at **571.272.6771**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to **571-273-8300**

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Customer Service Window:

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

/John O Preston/

Art Unit: 3691

Examiner, Art Unit 3691

March 11, 2010

/Kelly Campen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691